

THE ARIKI-TERASOMA-YAMADA TENSOR SPACE AND THE BLOB ALGEBRA.

STEEN RYOM-HANSEN

ABSTRACT. We show that the Ariki-Terasoma-Yamada tensor module and its permutation submodules $M(\lambda)$ are modules for the blob algebra when the Ariki-Koike algebra is a Hecke algebra of type B . We show that $M(\lambda)$ and the standard modules $\Delta(\lambda)$ have the same dimensions, the same localization and similar restriction properties and are equal in the Grothendieck group. Still we find that the universal property for $\Delta(\lambda)$ fails for $M(\lambda)$, making $M(\lambda)$ and $\Delta(\lambda)$ different modules in general. Finally, we prove that $M(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the dual Specht module for the Ariki-Koike algebra.

1. Introduction.

In this paper we combine the representation theories of the Ariki-Koike algebra and of the blob-algebra. The link between the two theories is the tensor space module $V^{\otimes n}$ for the Ariki-Koike algebra defined in [ATY] by Ariki, Terasoma and Yamada.

The blob algebra $b_n = b_n(q, m)$ was defined by Martin and Saleur [MS] as a generalization of the Temperley-Lieb algebra by introducing periodicity in the statistical mechanics model. The blob algebra is also sometimes called the Temperley-Lieb algebra of type B , or the one-boundary Temperley-Lieb algebra, and indeed it has a diagram calculus generalizing the Temperley-Lieb diagram calculus. Our work treats the non-semisimple representation theory of b_n .

There is a natural embedding $b_n \subset b_{n+1}$ which gives rise to restriction and induction functors between the module categories. These functors are part of a powerful category theoretical formalism on the representation theory of the entire tower of algebras. It also involves certain localization and globalization functors F and G between the categories of b_n -modules for different n . We denote it the localization/globalization formalism.

The formalism is closely related to the fact that b_n is quasi-hereditary in the sense of Cline, Parshall and Scott, [CPS], (when $q + q^{-1} \neq 0$). Its parametrizing poset is $\Lambda_n := \{n, n-2, \dots, -n\}$. The standard modules $\Delta_n(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ can be defined by a diagram basis and have dimensions equal to certain binomial coefficients.

¹Supported in part by Programa Reticulados y Ecuaciones and by FONDECYT grants 1051024 and 1090701.

A main point of our work is the existence of a surjection π from the Hecke algebra $H(n, 2) = H_n(q, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ of type B_n to the blob algebra b_n , for appropriate choices of the parameters. It makes it possible to pullback b_n -modules to $H(n, 2)$ -modules and in this way the category of b_n -modules may be viewed as a subcategory of the $H(n, 2)$ -modules.

Since $H(n, 2)$ is a special case of an Ariki-Koike algebra it has a tensor module $V^{\otimes n}$ as described in [ATY]. As a first result we prove that $V^{\otimes n}$ and its 'permutation' submodules $M_n(\lambda)$ are b_n -module when $\dim V = 2$. We are then in position to apply the localization/globalization formalism to the module $M_n(\lambda)$, and to compare it to the standard module $\Delta_n(\lambda)$.

In our main results we show that the two modules have the same dimensions, share the same localization properties and even are equal in the Grothendieck group of b_n -modules. They also have related behaviors under restriction from b_n to b_{n-1} . Even so we find that $M_n(\lambda)$ and $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ are different modules in general. We show this by demonstrating that the universal property for $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ fails for $M_n(\lambda)$. To be more precise, we show that in general $GF M_n(\lambda) \not\cong M_n(\lambda)$ whereas it is known that $GF \Delta_n(\lambda) \cong \Delta_n(\lambda)$ (when $\lambda \neq \pm n$).

This rises the question whether $M_n(\lambda)$ may be identified with another 'known' module. We settle this question by considering the Specht module $S(n_1, n_2)$ for $H(n, 2)$, where (n_1, n_2) is a two-line bipartition associated with λ . We show that this module is the pullback of a b_n -module, also denoted $S(n_1, n_2)$, and that $M_n(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the contragredient dual of $S(n_1, n_2)$.

We find that, somewhat surprisingly, neither of the b_n -modules $M_n(\lambda)$, $S(n_1, n_2)$ nor their duals identify with the standard module $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ for b_n .

It is a pleasure to thank P. Martin for useful conversations. Thanks are also due to the referee for useful comments.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we shall briefly recall the results of [MW] and [ATY], the two main sources of inspiration for the present paper. Let us start out by the work of Martin-Woodcock [MW]. Among other things they realize the blob algebra b_n as a quotient of the Ariki-Koike algebra $H(n, 2)$ by the ideal generated by the idempotents associated with certain irreducible representations of $H(2, 2)$. It then turns out that this ideal has a simple description in terms of the $H(n, 2)$ -generators. Let us explain all this briefly.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. Let $H(n, 2) = H(n, q, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ be the unital $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra generated by $\{X, g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}\}$ with relations

$$g_i g_{i\pm 1} g_i = g_{i\pm 1} g_i g_{i\pm 1} \quad [g_i, g_j] = 0 \quad i \neq j \pm 1$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1 X g_1 X &= X g_1 X g_1 & [X, g_j] &= 0 \quad j > 1 \\
(g_i - q)(g_i + q^{-1}) &= 0 \\
(X - \lambda_1)(X - \lambda_2) &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

It is the $d = 2$ case of the Ariki-Koike algebra $H(n, d)$ or the cyclotomic Hecke algebra of type $G(d, 1, n)$, see [AK] and [BM]. For $\lambda_1 = -\lambda_2^{-1}$ it is the Hecke algebra of type B_n . Note that there is a canonical embedding $H(n, 2) \subset H(n+1, 2)$.

As usual, if k is an $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra we write $H_k(n, 2) := H(n, 2) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} k$ for the specialized algebra.

Recall the concept of cellular algebras, that was introduced by Graham and Lehrer in [GL] in order to provide a common framework for many algebras that appear in non-semisimple representation theory. It is shown in [GL] that the Ariki-Koike algebra is cellular for general parameters n, d . In our case $d = 2$ it also follows from [DJM].

Let k be a field and suppose that k is made into an $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra by mapping q, λ_1, λ_2 to nonzero elements q, λ_1, λ_2 of k . Assume that $q^4 \neq 1$, $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ and $\lambda_1 \neq q^2 \lambda_2$. Then there are formulas for $e^{-1}, e^{-2} \in H_k(2, 2)$, the primitive central idempotents corresponding to the two one-dimensional cell representations given by $(1^2, \emptyset)$, $(\emptyset, 1^2)$, see [MW] for a more precise statement concerning the actual cell modules that we are referring to and for the details. Let $I \subset H_k(n, 2)$ be the ideal in $H_k(n, 2)$ generated by e^{-1}, e^{-2} . Using the mentioned formulas, it is shown in (27) of [MW] that I is generated by either of the elements

$$\begin{aligned}
&(X_1 + X_2 - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2))(g_1 - q) \\
&(X_1 X_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)(g_1 - q)
\end{aligned}$$

where as usual $X_1 := X$, $X_i := g_{i-1} X_{i-1} g_{i-1}$ for $i = 2, 3, \dots$

Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and assume that n is a positive integer. The blob algebra $b_n = b_n(q, m)$ is the unital k -algebra on generators $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{n-1}\}$ and relations

$$U_i U_{i \pm 1} U_i = U_i, U_i^2 = -[2] U_i, U_0^2 = -[m] U_0, U_1 U_0 U_1 = [m - 1] U_1$$

for $i > 0$ and commutativity between the generators otherwise. As usual $[m]$ is here the Gaussian integer $[m] := \frac{q^m - q^{-m}}{q - q^{-1}}$. The blob algebra was introduced in [MS] via a basis of decorated Temperley-Lieb algebras, which explains its name. We shall however mostly need the above presentation of it. This is only one of several different presentations of b_n , the one used in [MW].

Let $H^{\mathcal{D}}(n, 2)$ be the quotient $H_k(n, 2)/I$ and choose

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{q^m}{q - q^{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{q^{-m}}{q - q^{-1}}$$

Using the above description of I , it is then shown in proposition (4.4) of [MW] that the map φ given by $\varphi : g_i - q \mapsto U_i$, $X - \lambda_1 \mapsto U_0$ induces a k -algebra isomorphism

$$\varphi : H^{\mathcal{D}}(n, 2) \cong b_n(q, m) \quad (1)$$

We finish this section by recalling the construction of the tensor representation of the Ariki-Koike algebra $H(n, d)$ found by Ariki-Terasoma-Yamada [ATY]. It is an extension to the Ariki-Koike case of Jimbo's classical tensor representation of the Hecke algebra, [J], and therefore basically amounts to the extra action of X factorizing through the relations. On the other hand, this action is quite non-trivial and is for example not local in the sense of [MW].

The [ATY] construction works for all Ariki-Koike algebras $H(n, d)$, but we shall only need the $d = 2$ case, which we now explain. Let V be a free $\mathcal{A}$ -module of rank two and let v_1, v_2 be a basis. Let $R \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(V \otimes V)$ be given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} R(v_i \otimes v_j) = qv_i \otimes v_j \quad \text{if } i = j \\ R(v_2 \otimes v_1) = v_1 \otimes v_2 \\ R(v_1 \otimes v_2) = v_2 \otimes v_1 + (q - q^{-1})v_1 \otimes v_2 \end{array} \right\}$$

Then the $H(n, 2)$ generator g_i acts on $V^{\otimes n}$ through

$$T_{i+1} := Id^{\otimes i-1} \otimes R \otimes Id^{\otimes n-i-1}$$

The g_i generate a subalgebra of $H(n, d)$ isomorphic to the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of type A and the above action is the $\dim V = 2$ case of the one found by Jimbo in [J]. The maximal quotient of it acting faithfully on $V^{\otimes n}$ is the Temperley-Lieb algebra TL_n .

For $j = 2, 3, \dots, n$ we shall need the $\mathcal{A}$ -linear map $S_j \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(V^{\otimes n})$, that by definition acts on $v = v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_{j-1}} \otimes v_{i_j} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n}$ through

$$S_j(v) = \begin{cases} qv & \text{if } i_{j-1} = i_j \\ v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_j} \otimes v_{i_{j-1}} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let $\theta := S_n S_{n-1} \dots S_2$ and let $\varpi \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(V^{\otimes n})$ be the map given by

$$v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n} \mapsto \lambda_{\delta(1)} v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n}$$

where $\delta(1) = 1$ if $i_1 = 1$ and $\delta(1) = 2$ if $i_1 = 2$. Then $\theta\varpi$ is given by

$$\theta\varpi : v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes v_{i_3} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n} \mapsto \lambda_{\delta(1)} q^{a-1} v_{i_2} \otimes v_{i_3} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_n} \otimes v_{i_1}$$

where a is the number of i_k such that $i_k = i_1$. Now [ATY] define the action of $X \in H(n, 2)$ by the formula

$$T_1 := T_2^{-1} T_3^{-1} \dots T_n^{-1} \theta\varpi$$

As mentioned in [ATY], the proof that the $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{n-1}$ satisfy the Ariki-Koike relations works in specializations as well. One of the steps of their proof is the following lemma, which we shall need later on.

Lemma 1. *Let $Y_{j,p}$ be the $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule of $V^{\otimes n}$ generated by basis elements $v = v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}$ such that $i_p \geq j$. Then if $v \in Y_{j,p}$ we have that*

$$T_{p+1}^{-1} T_{p+2}^{-1} \cdots T_n^{-1} S_n S_{n-1} \cdots S_{p+1} v = v \text{ mod } Y_{j+1,p}$$

3. The Ariki-Terasoma-Yamada tensor space as blob algebra module

From now on we assume that k is an algebraically closed field, such that $q, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in k$ and $q^4 \neq 1$, $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, $\lambda_1 \neq q^2 \lambda_2$. We moreover assume that $\lambda_1 = \frac{q^m}{q-q^{-1}}$ and $\lambda_2 = \frac{q^{-m}}{q-q^{-1}}$ where m is an integer. With these assumptions the results of the previous section are valid.

In this section we prove that the Ariki-Koike action given by the above construction factors through the blob algebra. Let V, T_i be as in the previous section. Then we have

Theorem 1. $(T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)(T_2 - q) = 0$ in $\text{End}_k(V^{\otimes n})$.

Proof. We start by noting that by the Ariki-Koike relations

$$(T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)(T_2 - q) = (T_2 - q)(T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)$$

We show that $(T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)(T_2 - q) = 0$ on all basis elements of $V^{\otimes n}$. It clearly holds for $v = v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}$ where $i_1 = i_2$, so we assume $i_1 \neq i_2$. If $i_1 = 2$ and $i_2 = 1$ we get by lemma 1 that the action of T_1 on v is multiplication by λ_2 . But then $T_2 T_1 T_2$ acts on v through

$$\begin{aligned} & T_2 T_1 T_2 (v_2 \otimes v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}) = \\ & T_2 T_2^{-1} T_3^{-1} \cdots T_n^{-1} S_n S_{n-1} \cdots S_2 \varpi T_2 (v_2 \otimes v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}) = \\ & \lambda_1 T_3^{-1} \cdots T_n^{-1} S_n S_{n-1} \cdots S_3 (v_2 \otimes v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}) = \\ & \lambda_1 (v_2 \otimes v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}) \text{ mod } Y_{2,2} \end{aligned}$$

by lemma 1 once again. Actually, since $T_3^{-1} \cdots T_n^{-1} S_n S_{n-1} \cdots S_3$ does not change the first coordinate of v we can even calculate modulo the subspace Y_2 of $V^{\otimes n}$ generated by $v_2 \otimes v_2 \otimes v_{i_3} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}$. We conclude that $(T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)v \in Y_2$. But clearly $T_2 - q$ kills Y_2 and we are done in this case.

On the other hand, we have that

$$V^{\otimes n} = \ker(T_2 - q) + \text{span}_k \{v_2 \otimes v_1 \otimes v_{i_3} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n} \mid i_j = 1, 2 \text{ for } j \geq 3\}$$

and hence $V^{\otimes n}$ is also equal to

$$\ker(T_2 - q)(T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2) + \text{span}_k \{v_2 \otimes v_1 \otimes v_{i_3} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n} \mid i_j = 1, 2 \text{ for } j \geq 3\}$$

Combining with the above, the theorem follows. $\square$

Remark 1. *The formula of the theorem is easy to implement in a computer system and amusing to verify.*

Corollary 1. $V^{\otimes n}$ is a $b_n(q, m)$ -module with $U_i, i \geq 1$ acting through $T_{i+1} - q$ and U_0 through $T_1 - \lambda_1$.

Proof. Using that $\lambda_1 = \frac{q^m}{q-q^{-1}}$ and $\lambda_2 = \frac{q^{-m}}{q-q^{-1}}$ (and the other assumptions on the parameters) this follow from the theorem and proposition (4.4) of [MW]. $\square$

4. Localization and globalization

The main results of our paper depend on a category theoretical approach to the representation theory of b_n that we shall now briefly explain. It was introduced by J. A. Green in the Schur algebra setting, [G], but has turned out to be useful in the context of diagram algebras as well, see e.g. [CVM], [M] and [MR]. In the case of the blob algebra b_n , a good references to the formalism is [MW1], see also [CGM].

Recall first that $[2] \neq 0$ in k so that we can define $e := -\frac{1}{[2]}U_{n-1}$. This is an idempotent of b_n and we have that $eb_ne \cong b_{n-2}$, see [MW1]. Hence it gives rise to the exact localization functor

$$F : b_n\text{-mod} \rightarrow b_{n-2}\text{-mod}, \quad M \mapsto eM$$

It has a left adjoint, the globalization functor

$$G : b_{n-2}\text{-mod} \rightarrow b_n\text{-mod}, \quad M \mapsto b_ne \otimes_{eb_ne} M$$

which is right exact. Let $\Lambda_n := \{n, n-2, \dots, -n+2, -n\}$. Under our assumption $[2] \neq 0$, the category $b_n\text{-mod}$ is quasi-hereditary with labeling poset $(\Lambda_n, \prec)$, where $\lambda \prec \mu \Leftrightarrow |\lambda| > |\mu|$. Hence for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ we have a standard module $\Delta_n(\lambda)$, a costandard module $\nabla_n(\lambda)$, a simple module $L_n(\lambda)$, a projective module $P_n(\lambda)$ and an injective module $I_n(\lambda)$. The simple module $L_n(\lambda)$ is the unique simple quotient of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$. In general $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ and $L_n(\lambda)$ are different.

One can find in [MW1] a diagrammatical description of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$. We shall however first of all need the following category theoretical properties of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$. Assume first that $n \geq 3$ to avoid b_n for $n \leq 0$ that we have not defined. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} F\Delta_n(\lambda) &\cong \begin{cases} \Delta_{n-2}(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ G \circ F\Delta_n(\lambda) &\cong \begin{cases} \Delta_n(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the second isomorphism is the adjointness map of the pair F and G . Note that the second statement is false if $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ is replaced by $\nabla_n(\lambda)$. Together with

$$\Delta_n(\pm n) \cong L_n(\pm n) \cong \nabla_n(\pm n)$$

and

$$FL_n(\mu) \cong \begin{cases} L_{n-2}(\mu) & \text{if } \mu \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

these properties give the universal property for $\Delta_n(\lambda)$. For assume that N is a b_n -module with $[N : L_n(\lambda)] = 1$ satisfying $[N : L_n(\mu)] \neq 0$ only if $\mu \prec \lambda$. Then applying a sequence of functors F until arriving at $L_{|\lambda|}(\lambda)$ followed by a similar sequence of functors G , we obtain a nonzero homomorphism $\Delta_n(\lambda) \rightarrow N$. In other words, $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ is projective in the category of b_n -modules whose simple factors are all of the form $L_n(\mu)$ with $\mu \preceq \lambda$.

Let us now return to the tensor space module $V^{\otimes n}$ for b_n from the previous section. For $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$, we denote by $M(\lambda) = M_n(\lambda)$ the 'permutation' module. By definition, its basis vectors are $v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n}$ satisfying

$$\lambda = \#\{j \mid i_j = 1\} - \#\{j \mid i_j = 2\}$$

It is clear from the previous section that it is a b_n -submodule of $V^{\otimes n}$.

We shall frequently make use of the *sequence* notation that was introduced in [MR] for the basis vectors of $V^{\otimes n}$. Under it 112 corresponds to $v_1 \otimes v_1 \otimes v_2$ and so on. As in [MR] the set of sequences of 1s and 2s of length n is denoted seq_n . The subset of these sequences with 1 appearing n_1 times is denoted $\text{seq}_n^{n_1}$. With this notation $M_n(\lambda)$ has basis seq_n^a where $a = \frac{\lambda+n}{2}$. Its dimension is given by the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{a}$. This is also the dimension of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$.

We shall also need the underline notation from [MR]. It is useful for doing calculations in FM where M is a submodule of $V^{\otimes n}$. In the present setup it is given by $\underline{12} := q^{-1}12 - 21$ for $n = 2$ and extended linearly to higher n . For example, for $n = 3, \lambda = 1$ we get the following identities in $FM_n(\lambda) = eM_n(\lambda)$

$$\underline{112} = [2]e(112) = -U_2(112) = -(T_3 - q)(112) = -(121 - q^{-1}112)$$

Since $M_n(\lambda)$ and $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ have the same dimension one might guess that they are isomorphic b_n -modules. To see whether this is true one would have to verify for $M_n(\lambda)$ the category theoretical properties given in (2). The following theorem shows that the first of these indeed holds.

Theorem 2. *For $n \geq 3$ there is an isomorphism of b_{n-2} -modules*

$$FM_n(\lambda) \cong \begin{cases} M_{n-2}(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The theorem is easy to verify for $\lambda = \pm n$ so let us assume that $\lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$. Let $f : M_{n-2}(\lambda) \rightarrow FM_n(\lambda)$ be the k -linear map given by

$$i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} \mapsto i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} \underline{12} := q^{-1} i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} 12 - i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} 21$$

We show that f is a b_{n-2} -linear isomorphism.

But by lemma 1 of [MR] we already know that f is a vector space isomorphism and that it is linear with respect to the Temperley-Lieb action. Hence we must show that f is linear with respect to the action of X . Here X acts on the left hand side through the restriction to $M_{n-2}(\lambda)$ of $T_1 \in \text{End}_k(V^{\otimes n-2})$ whereas it acts on the right hand side through the restriction to $FM_n(\lambda)$ of $\frac{-1}{[2]}(T_n - q)T_1\frac{-1}{[2]}(T_n - q) \in \text{End}_k(V^{\otimes n})$. Since we assume $n \geq 3$ the factors of the product commute. Noting furthermore that $\frac{-1}{[2]}(T_n - q)$ acts through the identity on $FM_n(\lambda)$, we get that the action of X on the right hand side is nothing but the restriction of $T_1 \in \text{End}_k(V^{\otimes n})$ to $FM_n(\lambda)$.

It is now enough to show that f is linear with respect to $T_1 \in \text{End}_k(V^{\otimes n-2})$ and $T_1 \in \text{End}_k(V^{\otimes n})$, in other words that

$$f(T_2^{-1} \cdots T_{n-2}^{-1} S_{n-2} \cdots S_2 \varpi v) = T_2^{-1} \cdots T_{n-1}^{-1} T_n^{-1} S_n S_{n-1} \cdots S_2 \varpi f(v)$$

for all $v \in M_{n-2}(\lambda)$. For this we first note that f clearly commutes with $T_2, \dots, T_{n-2}, S_2, \dots, S_{n-2}$, and ϖ . Since these are all invertible, we are reduced to proving that

$$f(v) = T_{n-1}^{-1} T_n^{-1} S_n S_{n-1} f(v) \text{ for all } v \in M_{n-2}(\lambda) \quad (3)$$

This equation only involves the last three factors of $f(v)$ so we may assume that $n = 3$. But for $n = 3$, the cases $\lambda = \pm 3$ of (3) are trivially fulfilled, leaving us the $\lambda = \pm 1$ cases.

If $\lambda = 1$ we have that

$$\text{Im } f = eM_3(1) = \text{span}_k\{ \underline{112} \} = \text{span}_k\{ 112 - q121 \}$$

and we must prove that $T_2^{-1} T_3^{-1} S_3 S_2 (112 - q121) = 112 - q121$ or

$$S_3 S_2 (112 - q121) = T_3 T_2 (112 - q121) \quad (4)$$

The left hand side of this equation is $q(121 - q211)$ whereas the right hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 T_2 (112 - q121) &= T_3 (q112 - q(211 + (q - q^{-1})121)) = \\ &= T_3 (q112 - q211 - (q^2 - 1)121) = \\ &= q121 + (q^2 - 1)112 - q^2 211 - (q^2 - 1)112 = q121 - q^2 211 \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

If $\lambda = -1$ we have that

$$\text{Im } f = eM_3(-1) = \text{span}_k\{ 212 - q221 \}$$

and so the equivalent of equation (4) is

$$S_3 S_2 (212 - q221) = T_3 T_2 (212 - q221)$$

The left hand side of this is $q(112 - q212)$, and the right hand side is

$$T_3 T_2(212 - q221) = T_3(122 - q^2 221) = q122 - q^2 212$$

as claimed. The theorem is proved. $\square$

We now go on to consider the analogue for $M_n(\lambda)$ of the second category theoretical property for $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ in (2). It turns out *not* to hold for $M_n(\lambda)$. Let us be more precise. Let $\text{seq}_n^{n_1}$ be the basis for $M_n(\lambda)$ as above and define $n_2 := n - n_1$ such that $\lambda = n_1 - n_2$. We then have the following result.

Lemma 2. *Let $n \geq 3$ and suppose that q is an l th primitive root of unity, where l is odd. Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$. Then we have*

- a) *The adjointness map $\varphi_\lambda : G \circ FM_n(\lambda) \rightarrow M_n(\lambda)$ is surjective if and only if $n_2 \not\equiv m \pmod{l}$.*
- b) *The adjointness map $\varphi_\lambda : G \circ FM_n(\lambda) \rightarrow M_n(\lambda)$ is injective iff $n_2 \not\equiv m \pmod{l}$.*
- c) *The adjointness map $\varphi_\lambda : G \circ FM_n(\lambda) \rightarrow M_n(\lambda)$ is an isomorphism iff $n_2 \not\equiv m \pmod{l}$.*

Proof. Part c) obviously follows by combining a) and b). Let us now prove a). Assume first that $n_2 \not\equiv m \pmod{l}$ and suppose that φ_λ is not surjective.

Note first that for $w \in \text{seq}_{n-2}^{n_1-1}$ and $(i_{n-1}, i_n) = (1, 2)$ or $(2, 1)$ we have that $e(wi_{n-1}i_n) = c w \underline{12}$ for some scalar $c \in k^\times$. Recall next from [MR] that $b_n e$ is generated as an $eb_n e$ right module by the set

$$\mathcal{G} := \{U_{n-1}, U_{n-2}U_{n-1}, \dots, U_0 \cdots U_{n-2}U_{n-1}\}$$

and that $\varphi_\lambda : G \circ FM_n(\lambda) \rightarrow M_n(\lambda)$ is the multiplication map

$$b_n e \otimes_{eb_n e} eM_n(\lambda) \rightarrow M_n(\lambda), \quad U \otimes m \mapsto Um$$

Suppose that $w = i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2}$. A key point, used in [MR] as well, is now that for $j \geq 1$ the multiplication of $U_j U_{j+1} \cdots U_{n-1} \in \mathcal{G}$ on $w \underline{12}$ shifts the underline to position $(j, j+1)$ in the following sense

$$U_j U_{j+1} \cdots U_{n-1} w \underline{12} = -[2] i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{j-1} \underline{12} i_{j+2} \cdots i_n$$

as follows easily from the definitions. Using it we get that $\text{im} \varphi_\lambda$ is the span of

$$I_1 = \{(X - \lambda_1) \underline{12} x \mid x \in \text{seq}_{n-2}^{n_1-1}\}$$

together with

$$I_2 = \{v_1 \underline{12} v_2 \mid v_1 \in \text{seq}_k^{l_1}, v_2 \in \text{seq}_{n-2-k}^{n_1-l_1-1}, k \leq n-2, l_1 \leq n_1-1\}$$

Let $N_2 := \text{span}_k \{w \mid w \in I_2\}$. Then $Q := M_n(\lambda)/N_2$ is a vector space of dimension one since the elements of I_2 can be viewed as straightening rules that allow us to rewrite any element of $M_n(\lambda)/N_2$ as a scalar multiple of

$1^{n_1}2^{n_2}$ (or $2^{n_2}1^{n_1}$). Indeed, by the definition of 12 we have the following identity, valid in Q

$$v_1 12 v_2 = q v_1 21 v_2 \quad \text{for } v_1 \in \text{seq}_{l_k}^{l_1}, v_2 \in \text{seq}_{n-2-k}^{n_1-l_1-1} \quad (5)$$

But $N_2 \subseteq \text{im } \varphi_\lambda$ and so we conclude $\text{im } \varphi_\lambda = N_2$ since φ_λ is not surjective.

But then Q is a b_n -module. It has dimension one and hence the action of X on Q is given by a scalar, which we shall work out. Notice first that if $i \geq 2$ then T_i^{-1} acts through the constant q^{-1} on Q , since U_i acts as zero for $i > 0$.

Set $v = 1^{n_1}2^{n_2} \in Q$. Since X acts through $T_2^{-1}T_3^{-1} \cdots T_n^{-1}\theta\varpi$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} Xv &= \lambda_1 q^{n_1-1} q^{-n_1-n_2+1} 1^{n_1-1} 2^{n_2} 1 = \\ &= \lambda_1 q^{n_1-1} q^{-n_1-n_2+1} q^{-n_2} 1^{n_1} 2^{n_2} = \lambda_1 q^{-2n_2} 1^{n_1} 2^{n_2} = \lambda_1 q^{-2n_2} v \end{aligned}$$

using the straightening rules (5). Hence the scalar in question is $\lambda_1 q^{-2n_2}$.

Set now $w = 2^{n_2}1^{n_1} \in Q$. Then we get the same way

$$\begin{aligned} Xw &= \lambda_2 q^{n_2-1} q^{-n_1-n_2+1} 2^{n_2-1} 1^{n_1} 2 = \\ &= \lambda_2 q^{n_2-1} q^{-n_1-n_2+1} q^{n_1} 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1} = \lambda_2 w \end{aligned}$$

The two scalars must be same, that is $\lambda_1 q^{-2n_2} = \lambda_2$ and hence $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 = q^{2m} = q^{2n_2}$. Since l is odd, this implies that $n_2 = m \pmod l$, which is the desired contradiction.

To prove the other implication we assume that $n_2 = m \pmod l$ and must show that φ_λ is not surjective. We show that $I_1 \subseteq N$ or equivalently $(N_1 + N_2)/N_2 = 0$ where $N_1 := \text{span}_k\{w \mid w \in I_1\}$.

Since the actions of X and U_i commute for $i = 3, \dots, n-1$, we get for any $w \in \text{seq}_{n-2}^{n_1-1}$ that

$$(X - \lambda_1) \underline{12} w = c X \underline{12} 1^{n_1-1} 2^{n_2-1} \pmod{N_2}$$

where $c \in k^\times$. We go on calculating modulo N_2 and find

$$\begin{aligned} X \underline{12} 1^{n_1-1} 2^{n_2-1} &= X q^{-1} 12 1^{n_1-1} 2^{n_2-1} - X 21 1^{n_1-1} 2^{n_2-1} \\ &= q^{-n_2-1} \lambda_1 21^{n_1-1} 2^{n_2-1} 1 - \lambda_2 q^{-n_1} 1^{n_1} 2^{n_2} \\ &= q^{-2n_2-n_1} \lambda_1 1^{n_1} 2^{n_2} - \lambda_2 q^{-n_1} 1^{n_1} 2^{n_2} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

because $\lambda_1 q^{-2n_2} = \lambda_2$. This finishes the proof of a). Note that for this last implication we do not need l to be odd.

We proceed to prove b). We use the same principle for proving injectivity as in the proofs of theorem 1 and proposition 8 of [MR], although the combinatorial setup is different.

Since $\mathcal{G}$ generates $b_n e$ as a right $eb_n e$ -module it induces a generating set of $G \circ FM_n(\lambda)$ as a vector space

$$\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{G} \otimes_{eb_n e} \text{seq}_{n-2}^{n_1-1} \underline{12}$$

We then have $I := \varphi_\lambda(\mathcal{M}) = I_1 \cup I_2$, where I_1 and I_2 are as above. Let us say that the elements of I_1 are of TL-type. The elements of I are not independent: there are trivial relations between the TL-type elements as follows

$$(Triv_1) \quad q^{-1} w_1 12 w_2 \underline{12} w_3 - w_1 21 w_2 \underline{12} w_3 = q^{-1} w_1 \underline{12} w_2 12 w_3 - w_1 \underline{12} w_2 21 w_3$$

for w_1, w_2, w_3 words in 1 and 2, i.e. belonging to appropriate seq_r^s ,

There are also certain trivial relations involving the first element $U_{0,\dots,n-1} := U_0 U_1 \cdots U_{n-1}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ and the TL-elements. To handle these define first $U_{0,\dots,n-1}^{\lambda_1} := (U_0 + \lambda_1) U_1 \cdots U_{n-1}$ and replace then $U_{0,\dots,n-1}$ by

$$\mathcal{U}_{0,\dots,n-1} = (U_{n-1} + q) (U_{n-2} + q) \cdots (U_1 + q) U_{0,\dots,n-1}^{\lambda_1}$$

in $\mathcal{G}$. By this, $\mathcal{G}$ remains a generating set of b_n as $eb_n e$ -module, since the expansion of $\mathcal{U}_{0,\dots,n-1}$ gives $U_{0,\dots,n-1}$ plus a linear combination of the other elements of $\mathcal{G}$ modulo $eb_n e$.

Now $U_0 + \lambda_1 = X$ and $U_i = T_{i+1} - q$ and so we get

$$\varphi_\lambda(\mathcal{U}_{0,\dots,n-1} \otimes_{eb_n e} i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} \underline{12}) = S_{n-1} S_{n-2} \cdots S_2 \varpi \underline{12} i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2}$$

Let us denote these elements by $\underline{1} i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} \underline{2}$. They are

$$\underline{1} i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} \underline{2} := -\lambda_2 q^{n_2-1} i_1 \cdots i_{n-2} 2 + \lambda_1 q^{n_1-2} 2 i_1 \cdots i_{n-2} 1$$

The trivial relations between the $\underline{1} i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{n-2} \underline{2}$ and the TL-type elements are then

$$(Triv_2) \quad q^{-1} \underline{1} w_1 12 w_2 \underline{2} - \underline{1} w_1 21 w_2 \underline{2} = -\lambda_2 q^{n_2-1} 1 w_1 \underline{12} w_2 \underline{2} + \lambda_1 q^{n_1-2} 2 w_1 \underline{12} w_2 \underline{1}$$

where w_1, w_2 are words in 1 and 2 belonging to appropriate seq_r^s ,

To get a better understanding of these trivial relations we now consider $w_1 \underline{12} w_2, \underline{1} w_3 \underline{2}$ as symbols and define

$$W_1 := \text{span}_k \{ w_1 \underline{12} w_2, \underline{1} w_3 \underline{2} \mid w_1 \in \text{seq}_k^l, w_2 \in \text{seq}_{n-k}^{l-n_1}, w_3 \in \text{seq}_n^{n_1} \}$$

and $W := W_1 / \text{span}_k \{ R \mid R \in Triv_1 \cup Triv_2 \}$. One checks on the relations that there is a linear map $\psi_\lambda : W \rightarrow G \circ FM_n(\lambda)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 \underline{12} w_2 &\mapsto U_i U_{i+1} \cdots U_{n-1} \otimes_{eb_n e} w_1 w_2 \underline{12}, \\ \underline{1} w_3 \underline{2} &\mapsto \mathcal{U}_{0,\dots,n-1} \otimes_{eb_n e} w_3 \underline{12} \end{aligned}$$

Using the relations $Triv_1$ and $Triv_2$, it is straightforward to check that the elements $22 \cdots 11 \cdots 111 \underline{12} i_k i_{k+1} \cdots i_n$ (with no 12 before the underline) and $\underline{1222} \cdots 111 \underline{2}$ generate W . We show that these elements map to a basis of $M_n(\lambda)$ under $\varphi_\lambda \circ \psi_\lambda$ which implies that φ_λ is injective.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\lambda \circ \psi_\lambda(22 \cdots 111 \underline{12} i_k \cdots i_n) &= 22 \cdots 111 \underline{12} i_k \cdots i_n \in M_n(\lambda) \\ \varphi_\lambda \circ \psi_\lambda(\underline{1222} \cdots 111 \underline{2}) &= \underline{1222} \cdots 111 \underline{2} \in M_n(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

The first kind of elements (of TL-type) were shown to be linearly independent in [MW1]. To show that $\underline{1222} \dots 111\underline{2}$ is independent of these, it is enough to show that it is nonzero modulo the TL-type elements. Calculating modulo the TL elements, we have $12 = q21$ and so we find that $\underline{1222} \dots 111\underline{2}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{12^{n_2-1}1^{n_1-1}2} &= -\lambda_2 q^{n_2-1} 12^{n_2-1}1^{n_1-1}2 + \lambda_1 q^{n_1-2} 2^{n_2}1^{n_1} \\ &= (-\lambda_2 q^{2n_2+n_1-2} + \lambda_1 q^{n_1-2}) 2^{n_2+1}1^{n_1+1} \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption of the lemma this is nonzero since $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 = q^{2m}$.

Finally the other implication of b) follows also from the last calculation since ψ_λ is surjective. We have proved the lemma. $\square$

A consequence of the lemma is that $M_n(\lambda)$ is not isomorphic to $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ in general. Moreover, we shall later in section 5 explain how the above proof can be used to deduce that $M_n(\lambda)$ is also not isomorphic to $\nabla_n(\lambda)$ in general.

On the other hand, we now prove by induction that $M_n(\lambda)$ and $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ are equal in the Grothendieck group of b_n -modules. The next lemma is the induction basis.

Lemma 3. *For $n \geq 1$ we have the following isomorphisms of b_n -modules*

$$a) \ M_n(n) \cong \Delta_n(n) \quad b) \ M_n(-n) \cong \Delta_n(-n) \quad c) \ M_2(0) \cong \Delta_2(0)$$

Proof. The parts a) and b) of the lemma are easy to check since all the involved b_n -modules are one dimensional and have trivial U_i actions for $i \geq 1$. One then just needs verify that $U_0 = X - \lambda_1$ acts the right way.

In order to prove part c) we first get for $n = 2$ by direct calculations that the matrices of U_1 and X with respect to the basis $\{12, 21\}$ of $M_2(0)$ are given by

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -q^{-1} & 1 \\ 1 & -q \end{pmatrix}, \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ -\lambda_1(q - q^{-1}) & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and hence the matrix of $U_0 = X - \lambda_1$ is

$$U_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda_1(q - q^{-1}) & -[m] \end{pmatrix}$$

since $[m] = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$. The ket basis of $\Delta_2(0)$, see [MW1], modulo multiplication by nonzero scalars, is given by $\{\cup, U_0 \cup\}$. Define φ by

$$\varphi : \underline{12} = q^{-1}12 - 21 \mapsto \cup, \quad U_0 \underline{12} \mapsto U_0 \cup$$

This is the desired b_n -isomorphism provided that $U_0 \underline{12}$ is nonzero and is an eigenvector of U_0 with eigenvalue $-[m]$. But by the above

$$U_0 \underline{12} = q^{-1}(-\lambda_1(q - q^{-1}) + q[m])21$$

The coefficient is nonzero iff $\lambda_1(q - q^{-1}) \neq q[m]$, which by $\lambda_1 = \frac{q^m}{q - q^{-1}}$ is equivalent to $q^{2m} \neq q^2$, which holds by the assumptions on q given in the beginning of section 3. But then 12 is automatically an eigenvector for U_0 of the right eigenvalue. $\square$

Theorem 3. *Assume that $n \geq 1$. Then $[\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] = [M_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)]$ for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_n$.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction on n . The induction basis $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ is provided by the above lemma. We assume the theorem to hold for all n' strictly smaller than n and prove it for n . Recall once again that the simple b_n -modules $L_n(\mu)$ satisfy that

$$FL_n(\mu) \cong \begin{cases} L_{n-2}(\mu) & \text{if } \mu \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By induction, exactness of F , the category theoretical property for $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ stated in (2) and Theorem (2), we then get for $\mu \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] &= [F\Delta_n(\lambda) : FL_n(\mu)] = [\Delta_{n-2}(\lambda) : L_{n-2}(\mu)] = \\ [M_{n-2}(\lambda) : L_{n-2}(\mu)] &= [FM_n(\lambda) : FL_n(\mu)] = [M_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)] \end{aligned}$$

and we need now only prove $[\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\pm n)] = [M_n(\lambda) : L_n(\pm n)]$.

But X acts semisimply in any b_n -module and so we obtain the following $\mathbb{C}[X]$ -module decompositions

$$\Delta_n(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda_n} L_n(\mu)^{d_{\lambda\mu}}, \quad M_n(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda_n} L_n(\mu)^{e_{\lambda\mu}}$$

where $d_{\lambda\mu} = [\Delta_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)]$ and $e_{\lambda\mu} = [M_n(\lambda) : L_n(\mu)]$. On the other hand, the only possible eigenvalues for X are λ_1 and λ_2 and we just saw that $d_{\lambda\mu} = e_{\lambda\mu}$ for $\mu \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$. Hence it is enough to show that $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ and $M_n(\lambda)$ are isomorphic $\mathbb{C}[X]$ -modules to deduce $d_{\lambda\mu} = e_{\lambda\mu}$ for the remaining $\mu \in \Lambda_n$ and so finish the proof. Indeed $L_n(n)$ and $L_n(-n)$ are both one dimensional, generated by eigenvectors for X of eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 respectively (recall $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ by our assumptions).

Now $\Delta_n(\lambda) \cong M_n(\lambda)$ as $\mathbb{C}[X]$ -modules if and only if the eigenspace multiplicities with respect to X are equal, so we show that this is the case.

For this we observe that the Bratteli diagram or Pascal triangle of restriction rules from b_n to b_{n-1} given in [MW1] can be used to determine the eigenvalues of X on $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ in the following way: A diagram of the diagram basis of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ is an eigenvector for $X = U_0 + \lambda_1$ of eigenvalue λ_2 iff its first line is marked with a filled blob. This induces the following

Pascal triangle pattern of multiplicities of the eigenvalue λ_2 .

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 n = 1 & & & 1 & & 0 \\
 n = 2 & & & 1 & & 1 & & 0 \\
 n = 3 & & 1 & & 2 & & 1 & & 0 \\
 n = 4 & 1 & & 3 & & 3 & & 1 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

For example, the first number 3 says that $\Delta_4(-2)$ has 3 diagrams with first line marked and hence λ_2 has multiplicity 3 in $\Delta_4(-2)$.

We must compare this pattern with the λ_2 -multiplicity of X in $M_n(\lambda)$. We have with the usual notation $\lambda = n_1 - n_2$ a basis of $M_n(\lambda)$ consisting of $B := \text{seq}_n^{n_1}$. Define B_1 as the sequences from $\text{seq}_n^{n_1}$ that begin with a 1 and B_2 as $\text{seq}_n^{n_1} \setminus B_1$. Put an order on B such that the elements of B_2 come before the elements of B_1 . Then by lemma 1 the action of X is upper triangular with λ_2 in the first $|B_2|$ diagonal elements and with λ_1 in the last $|B_1|$ diagonal elements. Hence the λ_2 -multiplicity of X is $|B_2|$. But the numbers B_2 satisfy the same Pascal triangle recursion as the above. The theorem is proved. $\square$

5. Specht modules and duality

In this section we shall relate the results of the previous sections to the $H_k(n, 2)$ -module $\tilde{S}^\lambda$ introduced in [DJM] for bipartitions $\lambda = (\tau, \mu)$ of n . The module $\tilde{S}^\lambda$ is a cell module for a certain cellular structure on $H_k(n, 2)$. Following modern terminology as used in for example [Ma], we shall therefore denote it the *Specht module* for $H_k(n, 2)$, although it is rather an analogue of the dual Specht module, and for $\lambda = (\tau, \mu)$ we shall accordingly use the notation $S(\lambda)$ or $S(\tau, \mu)$ for it. If $\lambda = ((n_1), (n_2))$ is a two-line bipartition of n , that is $n_1, n_2 \geq 0$ such that $n_1 + n_2 = n$, we shall also write $S(n_1, n_2)$ for $S(\lambda)$. Similarly, if $\lambda = ((1^{n_1}), (1^{n_2}))$ is a two-column bipartition, we shall write $S(1^{n_1}, 1^{n_2})$ for $S(\lambda)$.

In this section we show that the Specht module $S(n_1, n_2)$ as well as its contragredient dual $S(n_1, n_2)^*$ are modules for b_n . We moreover establish a b_n -isomorphism between $S(n_1, n_2)^*$ and $M_n(\lambda)$ where $\lambda = n_1 - n_2$. Finally, we prove an analogue of lemma 2 for $M_n(\lambda)^*$ and as a consequence we get that, somewhat surprisingly, neither of the modules $S(n_1, n_2), S(n_1, n_2)^*, M_n(\lambda), M_n(\lambda)^*$ is the pullback of the standard module $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ for b_n in general.

On the other hand, the pullback of the simple b_n -module $L_n(\lambda)$ to $H_k(n, 2)$ certainly is a simple $H_k(n, 2)$ -module. Thus, the statements of the previous paragraph are apparently not compatible with the statement of theorem 3 on equality in the Grothendieck groups, since the dominance order on bipartitions does not induce the quasi-hereditary order $\prec$ on Λ_n .

But note that the bipartitions $(\tau, \mu) = ((n_1), (n_2))$ are only Kleshchev (= restricted) in 'small' cases and therefore, apart from these small cases, $L_n(\lambda)$ is not the simple module associated with the bipartition $((n_1), (n_2))$ when viewed as $H_k(n, 2)$ -module, see [AJ]. In fact, it would be interesting to know which is the Kleshchev bipartition corresponding to $L_n(\lambda)$. (In the recent preprint [RH] we have solved this problem).

Let us now recall the combinatorial description of the permutation module $M_H(\tau, \mu)$ and the Specht module $S(\tau, \mu)$ for $H_k(n, 2)$ given in [DJM] and [DJMa]. Since these references use right modules rather than left modules and since they moreover use a slightly different presentation of $H_k(n, 2)$, the following formulas vary slightly from theirs.

Let (τ, μ) be a bipartition of n . Then a (τ, μ) -bitableau t is a pair (t^1, t^2) where t^1 is a τ -tableau and t^2 is a μ -tableau and where tableaux means fillings with the numbers $I_n = \{\pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \pm n\}$, where either i or $-i$ occurs exactly once. Two (τ, μ) -bitableaux (t^1, t^2) and (s^1, s^2) are said to be row equivalent if the tableaux obtained by taking absolute values in t^1 and s^1 are row equivalent in the usual sense, and if t^2 and s^2 are row equivalent. The equivalent class of the bitableau t is called a tabloid and is written $\{t\}$.

The permutation module $M_H(\tau, \mu)$ for $H_k(n, 2)$ is now

$$M_H(\tau, \mu) := \text{span}_k \{ \{t_1, t_2\} \mid (t_1, t_2) \text{ is a row standard } (\tau, \mu)\text{-bitableaux} \}$$

where the action can be read off from the lemmas 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 of [DJMa].

The Specht module $S_H(\tau, \mu)$ is now the quotient $M_H(\tau, \mu)/N_H(\tau, \mu)$ for $N_H(\tau, \mu)$ a certain submodule of $M_H(\tau, \mu)$. The standard tabloids induce a basis for $S(\tau, \mu)$

$$[t_1, t_2] := \{t_1, t_2\} + N_H(\tau, \mu)$$

where standard means that all entries are positive, and that each component is row standard and column standard.

We shall be especially concerned with the case of two-line bipartitions $(\tau, \mu) = ((n_1), (n_2))$. In that case, standard bitableaux are just row standard tableaux with positive entries and so the formulas for the action of $H_k(n, 2)$ on $M_H(\tau, \mu)$ induce the following formulas for the action on $[t] = [t_1, t_2] \in S(\tau, \mu)$

$$g_i[t] = \begin{cases} \sigma_i[t] & \text{if } (i \in t^1, i+1 \in t^2) \\ \sigma_i[t] + (q - q^{-1})[t] & \text{if } (i+1 \in t^1, i \in t^2) \\ q[t] & \text{if } (i, i+1 \in t^1) \text{ or } (i, i+1 \in t^2) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where the transposition $\sigma_i = (i, i+1)$ acts by permuting the entries. The action of X can only partially be made explicit. We consider first the action of X_i . Let $t^{\tau, \mu}$ be the (τ, μ) -bitableau with $\{1, \dots, n\}$ positioned

increasingly from left to right. For example, in the case $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 6$ we have

$$t^{\tau, \mu} = (\boxed{1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid 4 \mid 5}, \boxed{6 \mid 7 \mid 8 \mid 9 \mid 10 \mid 11})$$

Then by [DJM] we have

$$X_i[t^{\tau, \mu}] = \begin{cases} \lambda_1 q^{2(i-1)}[t^{\tau, \mu}] & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n_1 \\ \lambda_2 q^{2(i-n_1-1)}[t^{\tau, \mu}] & \text{if } i = n_1 + 1, \dots, n \end{cases}$$

To get the action on the other standard tableaux, one has to use the commutation rules of $H_n(n, 2)$. This implicit description is enough to prove the following theorem. Although it is a main philosophical idea of [MW], a formal proof was not given.

Theorem 4. $S(\tau, \mu)$ is a module for b_n when $(\tau, \mu) = ((n_1), (n_2))$.

Proof. By the isomorphism theorem (1) we must verify that

$$(X_1 X_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2)(g_1 - q) = 0 \quad (7)$$

in $\text{End}_k(S(n_1, n_2))$. Let therefore $[t] = [t_1, t_2]$ be the class of a standard bitableau for the bipartition $((n_1), (n_2))$. If 1, 2 both belong to t_1 or t_2 the statement is clear by (6). Using (6) once again, we have that

$$S(n_1, n_2) = \ker(g_1 - q) + \text{span}_k\{[t_1, t_2] \mid 1 \in t_1, 2 \in t_2\}$$

and we are left with the case $1 \in t_1, 2 \in t_2$. But then we can find $w = \sigma_{i_1} \dots \sigma_{i_r} \in \langle \sigma_i \mid i = 2, \dots, n-1 \rangle$ such that $w t^{\tau, \mu} = (t_1, t_2)$ and so we have $X_1[t_1, t_2] = \lambda_1[t_1, t_2]$ since $X = X_1$ commutes with all $g_2, \dots, g_{n-1}$.

We then consider the action of X_2 on $[t_1, t_2]$. Let t^{12} be the bitableau with $1 \in t^1, 2 \in t^2$ and the other entries increasing from left to right. For example, if $n_1 = 5$ and $n_2 = 6$, it is

$$t^{12} = (\boxed{1 \mid 3 \mid 4 \mid 5 \mid 6}, \boxed{2 \mid 7 \mid 8 \mid 9 \mid 10 \mid 11})$$

Then any $t = (t_1, t_2)$ with $1 \in t_1$ and $2 \in t_2$ is of the form $t = w t^{12}$ where $w = \sigma_{i_1} \dots \sigma_{i_r} \in \langle \sigma_i \mid i = 3, \dots, n-1 \rangle$. We claim that $X_2[t^{12}] = \lambda_2[t^{12}]$ modulo a linear combination of elements $[(t^1, t^2)]$ all satisfying $1, 2 \in t^1$. Believing this, we would also get that $X_2[t] = \lambda_2[t]$ modulo a similar linear combination of elements $[(t^1, t^2)]$, since $X_2 = g_1 X g_1$ and g_i commute for $i = 3, \dots, n$. From this (7) would follow.

To prove the claim for t^{12} we first use (6) to write

$$g_2 g_3 \dots g_{n_1-1} g_{n_1} \{t^{\tau, \mu}\} = \{t^{12}\}$$

Since $X_{n_1+1}^{-1} \{t^{\tau, \mu}\} = \lambda_2^{-1} \{t^{\tau, \mu}\}$ and $X_{n_1+1} = g_{n_1} \dots g_1 X_1 g_1 \dots g_{n_1}$ we deduce that

$$X_2 \{t^{12}\} = \lambda_2 g_2^{-1} \dots g_{n_1}^{-1} \{t^{\tau, \mu}\}$$

The claim now follows. $\square$

Recall that the contragredient dual $M^\circledast$ of an $H_k(n, 2)$ -module M is the linear dual $\text{Hom}_k(M, k)$ equipped with the $H_k(n, 2)$ action $(hf)(m) := f(h^*m)$ for $*$ the antiinvolution of $H_k(n, 2)$ given by $g_i^* := g_i$ and $X^* := X$.

Let $H'_k(n, 2)$ be the Ariki-Koike algebra $H_k(-q^{-1}, \lambda_2, \lambda_1)$. There is a k -algebra isomorphism $\theta : H_k(n, 2) \rightarrow H'_k(n, 2)$ given by

$$X \mapsto X, \quad g_i \mapsto g_i$$

Following [Ma] and [F], we define $S'(\tau, \mu)$ as the pullback under θ of the Specht module $S(\tau, \mu)$ for $H'_k(n, 2)$. Now Mathas proved in [Ma] the following result.

Theorem 5. *As $H_k(n, 2)$ -modules we have $S(\tau, \mu)^\circledast \cong S'(\mu', \tau')$ where τ' and μ' are the usual conjugate partitions of τ and μ .*

In the case $(\tau, \mu) = ((n_1), (n_2))$, the isomorphism of the theorem will also be an isomorphism of b_n -modules, since $*$ induces the usual antiinvolution $*$ of b_n that appears in the definition of contragredient duality in b_n -mod. Specially, $S'(1^{n_2}, 1^{n_1})$ will be a b_n -module as well.

The standard basis for $S(\mu', \tau') = S'(1^{n_2}, 1^{n_1})$ consists of the classes of bitableaux $t = (t_1, t_2)$ of the bipartition $((1^{n_2}), (1^{n_1}))$. We get for g_i the same action rules as before:

$$g_i[t] = \begin{cases} \sigma_i[t] & \text{if } (i \in t^1, i+1 \in t^2) \\ \sigma_i[t] + (q - q^{-1})[t] & \text{if } (i+1 \in t^1, i \in t^2) \\ q[t] & \text{if } (i, i+1 \in t^1) \text{ or } (i, i+1 \in t^2) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

As before, we have a special standard bitableau $t^{\mu', \tau'}$, this time with the numbers $1, \dots, n$ filled in increasingly first down the first column, then down the second column. The action of X_i on this $[t^{\mu', \tau'}]$ is given by

$$X_i[t^{\mu', \tau'}] = \begin{cases} \lambda_2 q^{2(i-1)}[t^{\mu', \tau'}] & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n_2 \\ \lambda_1 q^{2(i-n_2-1)}[t^{\mu', \tau'}] & \text{if } i = n_2 + 1, \dots, n \end{cases}$$

We are now in position to prove the following result

Theorem 6. *Let as before $\lambda = n_1 - n_2$. Then there is an isomorphism of b_n -modules $M_n(\lambda) \cong S(n_1, n_2)^\circledast$.*

Proof. We had by Mathas's theorem that $S(n_1, n_2)^\circledast \cong S'(1^{n_2}, 1^{n_1})$. We then define a linear map $\varphi : S'(1^{n_2}, 1^{n_1}) \rightarrow M_n(\lambda)$ by

$$\varphi([t_1, t_2]) = i_1 i_2 \dots i_n \text{ where } i_j = 1 \text{ iff } j \in t_2$$

It is easily checked that φ is linear with respect to g_i . On the other hand, we have that $\varphi(t^{\mu', \tau'}) = 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1}$. Using the next lemma we see that X_i acts through the same constant on $[t^{\mu', \tau'}]$ and as on $2^{n_2} 1^{n_1}$. This is enough to complete the proof by the commutation rules for $H_k(n, 2)$. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let $w = 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1} \in M_n(\lambda)$. Then*

$$X_i w = \begin{cases} \lambda_2 q^{2(i-1)} w & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n_2 \\ \lambda_1 q^{2(i-n_2-1)} w & \text{if } i = n_2 + 1, \dots, n \end{cases}$$

Proof. By lemma 1 the action of $X = X_1$ on w is multiplication by λ_2 , hence the action of $X_2 = T_2 X_1 T_2$ is multiplication by $q^2 \lambda_2$ and so on until we reach X_{n_2} .

To calculate the action of X_{n_2+1} we write

$$X_{n_2+1} = T_{n_2+2}^{-1} \dots T_n^{-1} S_n \dots S_2 \varpi T_2 \dots T_{n_2+1}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n_2+1} w &= T_{n_2+2}^{-1} \dots T_n^{-1} S_n \dots S_2 \varpi T_2 \dots T_{n_2+1} 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1} = \\ &\lambda_1 T_{n_2+2}^{-1} \dots T_n^{-1} S_n \dots S_2 1 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1-1} = q^{n_1-1} \lambda_1 T_{n_2+2}^{-1} \dots T_n^{-1} 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1} = \\ &\lambda_1 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1} = \lambda_1 w \end{aligned}$$

and the action is multiplication by λ_1 . This implies that X_{n_2+2} acts by $\lambda_1 q^2$ and so on. $\square$

We can now finally prove the result alluded to in the previous section.

Corollary 2. *Let $n \geq 3$ and suppose that q is an l th primitive root of unity, where l is odd. Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$. Then the adjointness map $\psi_\lambda : G \circ FM_n(\lambda)^{\otimes} \rightarrow M_n(\lambda)^{\otimes}$ is an isomorphism iff $n_1 = m \bmod l$.*

Proof. By the actions rules given above and theorem 6 the actions on $M_n(\lambda)^{\otimes}$ and $M_n(\lambda)$ are the same, except that λ_1 and λ_2 are interchanged as are n_1 and n_2 . We then repeat the argument of Lemma 2 and get that φ_λ is an isomorphism iff $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 = (-q)^{-2n_1}$, which is equivalent to $n_1 = m \bmod l$ as claimed. $\square$

Combining the corollary with lemma 2 we deduce that neither $M_n(\lambda)$ nor $M_n(\lambda)^{\otimes}$ is the standard module $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ for b_n in general. And then, combining this with the above theorem, we get the same statement for the Specht module $S_n(n_1, n_2)$ and for $S_n(n_1, n_2)^{\otimes}$.

6. Alcove geometry

We already saw that although $M_n(\lambda)$ does not identify with the standard module $\Delta_n(\lambda)$ for b_n in general, the two modules still have many features in common. In this section we shall further pursue this point, by considering the behavior of the restriction functor $\text{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n}$ from b_n -mod to b_{n-1} -mod on $M_n(\lambda)$.

It is known from [MW1] that the representation theory of b_n is governed by an alcove geometry on $\mathbb{Z}$ where l determines the alcove length and m the position of the fundamental alcove. There is a linkage principle and the decomposition numbers are given by Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials for the affine Weyl group $\mathcal{W}$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{sl}_2$.

Let us now set up some exact sequences that arise from restriction from b_n -mod to b_{n-1} -mod. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$. As a TL_{n-1} -module the restricted module $\mathrm{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the direct sum

$$M_{n-1}(\lambda + 1) \oplus M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$$

This is however not automatically the case when $\mathrm{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda)$ is considered as a b_{n-1} -module since X acts differently as element of b_n and of b_{n-1} . But the following statement always holds.

Lemma 5. *Assume $\lambda \in \Lambda_n \setminus \{\pm n\}$. Then there is a short exact sequence of b_{n-1} -modules*

$$0 \rightarrow M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1) \rightarrow \mathrm{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda) \rightarrow M_{n-1}(\lambda + 1) \rightarrow 0$$

Proof. We identify $M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$ with the span of the sequences of the form $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{n-1} 1$. Since for all $x \in \mathrm{seq}_{n-2}$ we have that $T_n^{-1} S_n(x11) = x11$ and

$$T_n^{-1} S_n(x21) = T_n^{-1}(x12) = x21$$

we get that $M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$ in this way is a b_{n-1} -submodule of $\mathrm{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda)$.

The quotient of $\mathrm{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda)$ by $M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$ is now generated by the classes of the sequences that end in 2. It can be identified with $M_{n-1}(\lambda + 1)$ since for $x \in \mathrm{seq}_{n-2}$ we have $T_n^{-1} S_n(x22) = x22$ and

$$T_n^{-1} S_n(x12) = T_n^{-1}(x21) = x12 \mod M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$$

The lemma now follows. $\square$

One observes that these sequences are very similar to the sequences for $\mathrm{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} \Delta_n(\lambda)$ given in lemma 4.5 of [MW1]. The only difference is that in [MW1] the appearances of $\lambda - 1$ and $\lambda + 1$ are interchanged when λ is negative. But $M_n(\lambda)$ is not the pullback of $\Delta_n(\lambda)$, as we already pointed out several times, and it seems to be a difficult task to compare the two systems of exact sequences.

We finish the paper by showing that the sequences of the lemma are split when λ is not a wall of the alcove geometry. This result could also have been obtained using theorem 3 and the linkage principle for b_n -mod, but we here deduce it from the machinery we have set up. We use central elements.

It is known, see for example the appendix of [MW], that the symmetric polynomials in the X_i are central elements of $H(n, 2)$ and hence also of b_n . We consider $z := X_1 X_2 \cdots X_n$ as an element of the centre $Z(b_n)$ of b_n and work out the action of it on $M_n(\lambda)$.

Lemma 6. *Recall that $\lambda = n_1 - n_2$. Then the action of z on $M_n(\lambda)$ is diagonal, given by the constant*

$$\lambda_1^{n_1} \lambda_2^{n_2} q^{n_1(n_1-1)} q^{n_2(n_2-1)}$$

Proof. As a b_n -module $M(\lambda)$ is generated by $2^{n_2} 1^{n_1}$. Since z is central, it is therefore enough to prove the assertion on that element. Recall that the X_i commute. By lemma 4 we find that $X_1 X_2 \dots X_{n_2}$ acts by

$$\lambda_2^{n_2} q^{0+2+4+\dots+2(n_2-1)} = \lambda_2^{n_2} q^{n_2(n_2-1)}$$

Once again by lemma 4, we have that $X_{n_2+1} \dots X_n$ acts by

$$\lambda_1^{n_1} q^{0+2+4+\dots+2(n_1-1)} = \lambda_1^{n_1} q^{n_1(n_1-1)}$$

The lemma now follows by combining. $\square$

We can now prove the promised splitting.

Theorem 7. *Assuming $\lambda \not\equiv -m \pmod{l}$, the exact sequences from lemma 5 are split.*

Proof. If the sequence were nonsplit, any preimage in $\text{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda)$ of the $M_n(\lambda + 1)$ generator $w = 2^{n_2} 1^{n_1}$ would generate a submodule $M \subset \text{res}_{b_{n-1}}^{b_n} M_n(\lambda)$ nonisomorphic to $M_n(\lambda + 1)$. Moreover M would map surjectively onto $M_n(\lambda + 1)$ and would have a composition factor in common with $M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$. But then z would act through the same constant on $M_n(\lambda + 1)$ and $M_n(\lambda - 1)$.

Let $\lambda = n_1 - n_2$. The action of z on $M_{n-1}(\lambda - 1)$ is

$$\lambda_1^{n_1-1} \lambda_2^{n_2} q^{(n_1-1)(n_1-2)} q^{n_2(n_2-1)}$$

and the action of z on $M_{n-1}(\lambda + 1)$ is

$$\lambda_1^{n_1} \lambda_2^{n_2-1} q^{n_1(n_1-1)} q^{(n_2-1)(n_2-2)}$$

Equating, we get

$$\lambda_2 q^{2(n_2-1)} = \lambda_1 q^{2(n_1-1)}$$

which implies that $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} = q^{2m} = q^{2(n_2-n_1)}$ and the theorem follows. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [AJ] S. Ariki, N. Jacon, Dipper-James-Murphy's conjecture for Hecke algebras of type B_n , to appear in Progress in Math. (Birkhäuser)
- [AK] S. Ariki, K. Koike, A Hecke algebra of $\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z} \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ and construction of its irreducible representations, Adv. Math. **106** (1994), 216-243
- [ATY] S. Ariki, T. Terasoma, H. Yamada, Schur-Weyl reciprocity for the Hecke algebra of $\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z} \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$, J. Algebra **178** (1995), 374-390
- [BM] M. Broué, G. Malle, Zyklotomische Heckealgebren, Astérisque **212** (1993), 119-189
- [CPS] E. Cline, B. Parshall, L. L. Scott, Finite dimensional algebras and highest weight categories, J. Algebra **117** (1988), 504-521

- [DJM] R. Dipper, G. James, E. Murphy, Hecke algebras of type B_n at roots of unity, Proc. London. Math. Soc. **70** (1995), 505-528
- [DJMa] R. Dipper, G. James, A. Mathas, The (Q, q) -Schur algebra, Proc. London. Math. Soc. **77** (1998), 327-361
- [CGM] A. G. Cox, J. Graham, P. P. Martin, The blob algebra in positive characteristic, J. Algebra **266**, No. 2, 584-635 (2003)
- [CVM] A. G. Cox, M. De Visscher, P. P. Martin, The blocks of the Brauer algebra in characteristic zero, Representation Theory **13** (2009), 272-308
- [F] M. Fayers, Weights of multipartitions and representations of Ariki-Koike algebras II: canonical bases J. Algebra **319** (2008) 2963-2978
- [G] J. A. Green, Polynomial representations of GL_n , Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **830**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1980
- [GL] J. Graham, G. I. Lehrer, Cellular algebras, Inventiones Math. **123** (1996), 1-34
- [H] P. N. Hoefsmit, Representations of Hecke algebras of finite groups with BN -pairs of classical type, Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1979
- [J] M. Jimbo, A q -difference analogue of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the Yang-Baxter equation, Lett. Math. Phys. **10** (1985), 63-69
- [Ma] A. Mathas, Tilting modules for cyclotomic Hecke algebras, J. Reine Angew. Math. **562** (2003), 137-169
- [MR] P. P. Martin, S. Ryom-Hansen, Virtual Algebraic Lie Theory, Tilting modules and Ringel duality for blob algebras, Proc. London Math. Soc. **89** (2004), 655-675
- [MS] P. P. Martin, H. Saleur, The blob algebra and the periodic Temperley-Lieb algebra, Lett. Math. Phys. **30** (1994), 189-206
- [MW] P. P. Martin, D. Woodcock, Generalized blob algebras and alcove geometry, LMS Journal of Computation and Mathematics **6**, (2003), 249-296
- [MW1] P. P. Martin, D. Woodcock, On the structure of the blob Algebra, J. Algebra **225**, 957-988 (2000)
- [RH] S. Ryom-Hansen, Cell structures on the blob algebra, arXiv:0911.1923